

# MINUTES OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 4 February 2014 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Liam Curran (Chair), Suzannah Clarke (Vice-Chair), Obajimi Adefiranye, John Bowen, Julia Fletcher, Ami Ibitson, Mark Ingleby, Marion Nisbet and Eva Stamirowski and Alan Hall

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Carl Handley, Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager), Lesley Brooks (Service Group Manager, Parking), Nick Harvey (Cycling Programme Manager), John Miller (Head of Planning) and Simon Moss (Policy and Development Manager, Transport)

## 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2013

Following discussion of section 5.3-5.4 the Committee resolved to note its concerns about the production of recycling league tables. It was felt that Lewisham's poor performance in official league tables should be challenged based on information provided by officers. Specifically, it was believed that the bias against Lewisham's waste to energy solution to diversion from landfill should be given a higher status in league tables, and that failing this, Lewisham should produce its own league table.

Following discussion of section seven, the Committee resolved to note the suggestion that the Sayes Court Garden project should produce a visual representation of their plans, in order to aid communication of the Sayes Court vision.

## 2. Declaration of interests

Councillor Ingleby declared a non-prejudicial interest in relation to item five as Chair of the Friends of Grove Park nature reserve.

## 3. Government parking consultation

Lesley Brooks (Service Group Manager, Parking) introduced the report; the following key points were noted:

- The government was consulting on changes to local authority parking enforcement.
- The changes had been brought forward, in part, because of the Portas review of high streets.
- Officers believed that the consultation did not propose anything which would have a significant detrimental impact on parking enforcement in Lewisham.
- Enforcement in the borough was applied fairly, and was balanced to meet the demand for short term parking near businesses, where this was required.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- It was not anticipated that the proposals would result in any significant changes to engagement with the community.

- The parking service's three year implementation plan was formulated with the concerns of local people in mind.
- The consultation put forward proposals to formalise the process for instigating reviews of parking enforcement based on local petitions. With existing resources, it would be difficult for the council to respond to a new regime of formal petitions about changes to parking.
- The changes to the rules on use of CCTV enforcement were being proposed to deal with authorities that had been 'overzealous' with their use of mobile CCTV.
- Lewisham only used CCTV enforcement in limited circumstances to deal with the most serious parking violations.
- Income from enforcement was ring-fenced for delivery of parking services and maintenance projects.
- The Council, TfL and housing providers in the borough would be required to make their own submissions to the consultation.
- Where signage was due to be installed as part of redevelopment schemes, Traffic signs and lining were co-ordinated at completion, where this was practically possible
- The Council aimed to develop enforcement schemes which reflected the needs of the locality – as long as there was no detrimental impact on safety.
- Lewisham offered a five minute 'grace period' for dropping off and picking up – this had to be balanced with the requirements for (and necessary turnover of) short term parking.
- A fifteen minute grace period would be unenforceable.
- The consultation would close on 14 February; the government had no timetable for responding to submissions.

Resolved: to note the report and endorse the response to the Government parking consultation proposed by officers.

#### **4. Planning service annual monitoring report**

John Miller (Head of Planning) introduced the report; the following key points were noted:

- The annual monitoring report provided an update on the implementation of planning policy in the preceding year. It also provided a 'look ahead' to future developments and included statistics about performance.

In response to questions, the following key points were noted:

- The section on neighbourhood plans provided an update on the preceding year – and did not include updates on organisations that might be putting forward plans in the near future.
- The increase in retail space in Loampit Vale did not relate to the leisure centre – but rather to business space.
- The Lewisham Gateway scheme was due to start in April, with the development of the first two blocks.
- It appeared as though there had been an increase in applications relating to protected trees. However, tree maintenance was a cyclical process – so it was not unusual for there to be fluctuations in applications.
- The information provided related to protected trees on private land rather than street trees or trees in parks.

- Grove Park was not designated as a district town centre. There were criteria for designating district centres, which Grove Park did not meet.
  - There were 93 shopping parades of various sizes in the borough; the Committee had previously considered the role of these centres.
  - Design was a planning consideration – and a matter for Members of planning committees.
  - The design review panel was made up of architects and practitioners from a group of experts from across London.
  - No detailed analysis had been carried out to ascertain the number of planning decisions that had been upheld/overturned in comparison with decisions accepted or rejected by planning committees. However, there were no apparent trends in the outcome of appeals.
  - The Council worked collectively to meet the challenge of providing new school places.
  - The requirement for new classrooms was a London wide issue, which required a mixed array of solutions. Work in Lewisham to enlarge schools was being led by the Children and Young People directorate.
  - Census categories had been used to present demographic information about the ethnic origin of residents in Lewisham. This did not include an additional breakdown of the 'white other' category, though it was recognised that the individual groups within this category may well have different needs.
  - There were three enforcement officers in the planning department and each had a substantial workload. The Council had agreed to concentrate on the most serious cases of contravention.
  - About 500 issues a year were reported to the department. The Council had committed to focusing on serious contraventions, within existing resources.
- Resolved: to note the report.

## **5. Update on plans for the Bakerloo line, DLR and Overground**

Simon Moss (Transport Policy and Development Manager) introduced the report; the following key points were noted:

- The report provided an update on the Docklands Light Railway (DLR), Overground and Bakerloo line but it was unlikely that Lewisham would get all three rail improvements.
- Over the past year there had been concurrent studies by Transport for London (TfL) looking at the feasibility of extending the DLR and Bakerloo line.
- Officers were concerned about potential plans to extend the DLR through the borough- because the extension would not fit alongside existing infrastructure – and had the potential to create substantial disruption as it passed through the borough. For example, one version of the proposals would take the line through Ladywell fields, which would be unacceptable.
- It was also clear from TfL's DLR feasibility studies that the benefit cost ratio was likely to be too low to make the case for the extension.
- The ratio was estimated to be less than 1 – meaning for every pound spent there would be less than one pound in benefits generated. As a minimum requirement a viable transport scheme should have a ratio of more than two.

- The Mayor of Lewisham had written to the Mayor of London to express disappointment at the findings of the DLR study – and to reiterate the borough’s interest in the extension of the London Overground via Lewisham.
- It was most likely that the extension of the Bakerloo line would take over the Hayes line – freeing up capacity for the Overground to operate via Lewisham.
- It was recognised that there was insufficient capacity at Lewisham at present to extend the Overground, therefore, any Overground extension would need to be combined with an extension of the Bakerloo line.
- The Bakerloo line had a cost benefit ratio of 3.5. It was a more expensive project than the Overground but this was a healthy ratio.
- The extension of the Bakerloo line would be estimated to create more than £7.5B pounds of benefits as a result of its £2B cost.
- There were reasons for optimism; however, there were also a number of unresolved issues.
- Primarily, it was not clear how any spare capacity created at Lewisham station would be used. The space would be valuable and all parties involved would be keen to utilise it.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- The cost benefit ratio of the Bakerloo line extension had substantially increased in the time since the Committee had last considered the issue. It was not clear why this was the case – but it was likely that it was a result of changing demographics and assumptions about future regeneration in the borough.
- There were no immediate plans to commission further feasibility work from consultants.
- LB Bromley was committed to the extension on the DLR- but it was recognised that there were significant limitations which would need to be addressed in order to make it feasible.
- In its current form, with the low cost benefit ratio, the extension of the DLR was not feasible.
- There was a strong case for the extension of the Bakerloo line. However, an Overground extension would be quicker and cheaper to deliver.
- There would need to be a commitment to extending the Bakerloo line before the borough could commit to an Overground extension. This might involve building a new station to the south of the town centre.
- It was recognised that the ‘Catford loop’ line was poorly served. Officers were not able to rule out the potential of using the line for the Bakerloo line.
- The DLR could not use ordinary rail track – and this ruled out the option of allowing the DLR to take over the Hayes Line.
- It wasn’t yet clear where any future Overground extension would start and finish. Lewisham would not, however, want to lose its connection to central London.
- Councillors could be involved in all stages of the planning process. Officers would return to the committee on a regular basis to provide updates, information and advice on developments.

Resolved: to note the report – and to recommend that the committee retains its focus on rail infrastructure in 2014/15.

## 6. Road safety and cycling

Nick Harvey (Cycling Programme Manager) introduced the report, the following key points were noted:

- The borough's cycling programme was informed by regional and national policy.
- There had been a major increase in cycling in Lewisham, much like the rest of the country.
- The Council supported a range of cycling initiatives — but not all were led by the transport team.
- The Mayor of London had appointed a cycling commissioner to review the implementation of cycle superhighways in London.
- It was clear from consultation that cyclists would prefer segregated tracks.
- Both cycle superhighways (four and five) planned in the borough were difficult to deliver. The layout of the Amersham gyratory in New Cross Gate was a major obstacle to any proposed route through the borough
- Current plans brought the superhighway to New Cross Gate as the Amersham gyratory made it difficult to take it further. However, plans for superhighways were being re-designed across London to a higher standard – and this should improve proposals for routes through the borough.
- The 'Quietways' programme was designed to encourage inexperienced cyclists- by following less busy routes. Lewisham would benefit from a Quietway being proposed between Waterloo and Greenwich Park.
- The development of Quietways would involve different measures from those employed on Super highways.
- It was hoped that the Waterloo – Greenwich line would be in delivery by 2015. There could also be five other routes running through the borough within the next ten years.
- Officers had been working on a cycle safety programme with cyclists and drivers. Work was particularly focused on drivers of heavy goods vehicles.
- Other initiatives were taking place with schools and a successful cycle loan scheme had been set up to encourage people to cycle by negating the upfront cost of starting to cycle.

In response to questions from the Committee; the following key points were noted:

- It was recognised that some cyclists were aggressive and rode dangerously however – this was likely to be the result of the poor conditions cyclists were required to negotiate. Better provision would result in less conflict.
- Air pollution was a significant problem for cyclists. The benefits of being active had to be weighed against the risks of inhaling traffic fumes. Nonetheless, cycling was part of the solution to air pollution – and should be encouraged.
- Shared use of parks and pavements would be an option in some circumstances – however – as cycling became more popular there would be more pressure placed on shared spaces, so it would be best to create dedicated spaces for cyclists; segregated cycling lanes would be the best option.
- Work was on-going to improve the safety of HGVs. TfL was currently working on proposals to ban HGVs without safety equipment from driving on its roads. The borough had also secured agreement from major

developers in the borough to ensure that their HGVs would have safety equipment fitted and their drivers would have CPC (certificate of professional competence) training.

Resolved: to note the report.

**7. Select Committee work programme**

Resolved: to remove the item on parks and street trees from the agenda and suggest that it be considered for the 2014/15 work programme; to add additional items on changes to carer parking permits and the regeneration strategy implementation plan to the agenda for the Committee's meeting on 12 March.

**8. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet**

None

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----